

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 14, and 28 are amended. The remaining claims are unchanged.

The claim amendments are supported by the application as originally filed, for instance, at paragraphs 1087-1089, 1092, and 1093 (pages 20-23, application as filed). No new matter has been added.

Applicant's Attorney thanks Examiner Chang for discussing the present application in the telephone interview of October 3, 2007. In the interview, Applicant's attorney discussed the lack of disclosure or suggestion in the cited references of the feature of a logical routing determined by an evaluation of routing scripts defined by the services, such that each service is capable of including one or more other services in the logical routing without being included in a route for physical delivery of the message. The independent claims have been amended to recite this feature.

As described in the present application:

[1092] To illustrate this concept, consider an example where service A includes service B into the message route. Service A can include service B into the route either prior to itself in the route (provided service A is not the originator of the message) or after itself in the route. In either case, message interchange network 150 would logically route the message first to service A, which includes service B into the route. Message interchange network 150 then logically routes the message to service B, and after service B produces a response, message interchange network 150 logically returns the response to service A. The point at which service A physically receives the message depends on whether service A included service B prior or after itself in the route. If service A includes service B prior to itself in the route, then the order of physical delivery is first to service B then to service A. Conversely, if service A includes service B after itself into the route, then the order of physical delivery is first to service A then to service B. In the latter case, the response from B is not necessarily physically delivered back to service A. Rather, it may be only logically delivered back to service A.

[1093] Services to which a message is logically routed do not necessarily have to also physically receive the message. In the above example, service A could have been logically routed, with physical delivery only to service B. Consider the following scenario. Suppose service X includes service A into the route and service A includes service B into the route. The logical routing of the message would proceed from service X to service A to service B back to service A back to service X. Service A can choose not to be included into the route for physical delivery, in which case the physical routing of the message is from service X to service B."

For the reasons explained in the telephone interview, Ims and Merrick, considered alone or in combination, offer no disclosure or suggestion of a “logical routing determined by an evaluation of routing scripts defined by individual ones of said plurality of services such that each of said services is capable of including one or more others of said plurality of services in said logical routing without being included in a route for physical delivery of said message,” as recited in newly amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 13, 14, and 28 have been amended to recite similar features as claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for similar reasons as claim 1. The remaining claims are dependent upon claims 1, 13, 14, or 28 and are, therefore, patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim on which they are based. The rejections of these claims should also be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In the telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that he believes the above-quoted features of the newly amended independent claims may distinguish the cited art, but that further review of the art was needed. Applicant’s Attorney requested that the Examiner telephone him at the number below, before issuing a further Office Action, if the Examiner believes that further claim amendments/arguments are needed to place the application in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, it is requested that he contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/John F. Griffith/
John F. Griffith
Reg. No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100